



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ment of State, and requires that department to submit to the House at its next session, a schedule of all the cases, which shall have been thus reported. With such a statement before Congress and the people, we apprehend it will not be easy to refrain from some energetic steps for procuring redress.

---

ART. X.—1. *Remarks, critical and historical, on an Article in the Fortyseventh Number of the North American Review, relating to Count Pulaski; addressed to the Readers of the North American Review.* By the AUTHOR of the 'Sketches of the Life of Greene.' Charleston, S. C. 8vo. pp. 37.

2. *A Reply to Judge Johnson's Remarks on an Article in the North American Review, relating to Count Pulaski.* By PAUL BENTALOU; Author of 'Pulaski Vindicated.' Baltimore. 8vo. pp. 41.

WE know of few authors more unfortunate than Judge Johnson, or whose case more sincerely deserves the commiseration of the friends of letters, and the patrons of literary enterprise. It is now about four years since he published his great work, entitled 'Sketches of the Life of General Greene,' in two quarto volumes, and in a style of typography much above the common standard of American printing. For such an effort as this, at once to illustrate a most important portion of American history, and encourage the arts, the author very naturally flattered himself, that he should meet with the applause of his countrymen. But from his own account, in his later writings, it would seem, that no man's expectations were ever more sadly disappointed. His hopes, so fresh and strong at first, have been withered in the bud, and have shrunk away from the chilling breath of public disfavor. The gantlet of authorship was never before run with so much peril, nor terminated with such disastrous consequences. D'Israeli himself would be puzzled to find matter for a more copious chapter of miseries.

The author complains of being attacked from all quarters; newspapers, pamphlets, periodical journals, and formidable volumes, have teemed with censures upon his work, and this not

in one part of the country only, but in every part. His facts have been questioned, his style criticised, many of his statements denied, his way of writing history condemned, and his talents for such an undertaking more than doubted. One would think, that, amidst such universal testimonies of disapprobation, these spontaneous strictures from all points of the compass, concurring to the same end, would raise at least a slight shadow of suspicion in the mind of an author, that they might not be wholly without foundation. But not so with Judge Johnson. The possibility of an error on his part seems never to have entered his thoughts. He imagines the whole world to be his enemies, who have seized upon this opportunity, in violation of truth, honesty, and justice, to pour out upon him the vials of their critical indignation. In opinions, which differ from his own, he 'discovers plainly the hand of personal enmity;' whoever dares to express such opinions, manifests a 'sheer ignorance of revolutionary history;' he is charged with 'credulity, ignorance, or deliberate imposition;' he is guilty of putting forth 'paltry pretexts,' and of saying things 'not worthy of the most common understanding;' he lends himself to 'an attempt to falsify history, and to extenuate or excuse crime;' he maintains positions, which none 'but an idiot could be found to contend about,' and which 'carry with them the most insulting imputations, both on the researches and the intellects of his readers;' he is 'a gasconader,' utters 'calumnies,' makes 'vain boasts and bold attempts at imposition,' aims 'most insidious blows,' and, in short, tells tales 'in which there cannot be one word of truth.' But we forbear. Such are some of the choice expressions which the biographer of Greene finds it in his heart to apply to what he calls that 'vainest of the mortal race,' the critics and reviewers, and to those officious sticklers for veracity in history, and meaning in language, who have taken the trouble to read his work, and to remark upon its character. These are all enemies, sworn enemies, and seek for nothing but to indulge their malicious propensities.

Now, if it were our business to inquire, we should like to be informed, how one luckless author has contrived to stir up such a host of enemies. The case is an extraordinary one. In our state of society, personal enmity against those of whom we have no personal knowledge, is by no means a common thing. When a man publishes a book, he makes a demand on the public; he calls on the people to purchase, read, and judge. It is hard, indeed, if readers cannot have the liberty, after this tax upon

them, to exercise their understanding, and express their opinions freely, and this without the imputation of enmity to the author, or subjecting themselves to be branded with illnatured epithets. The world will soon be weary of buying and reading at this rate. It must be remembered, that the reader, as well as the writer, is disposed to have his own opinion and maintain it; and when an author, whether from a too great sensitiveness, or a jealousy natural to his temper, chooses to take offence at such a liberty, use harsh and taunting language, and persist in affirming that to be right and true, which all other men declare to be erroneous, it cannot be supposed, that he will gain many new friends, or strengthen the attachment of old ones, by such a proceeding.

That our readers may go along with us the more easily, in the remarks about to be made, we shall first briefly state the case before us. When Judge Johnson published his '*Life of Greene*,' it was reviewed, as our evil stars would have it, in this *Journal*.\* Not long afterward, certain distant and half audible murmurs indicated to us, that the author was less enraptured with our estimate of his literary claims, than our good nature might incline us to wish, and that he was nowise backward in expressing his distrust of our critical sagacity, and even of our motives. Possessing, as we do, the tender feelings of reviewers, this intelligence could not of course but give us a momentary uneasiness. But what could be done, except to let it pass, like the complaints of other authors, who suffer themselves to be disappointed and angry, when the world will not discover their merits, and when reviewers are so cold blooded, as to praise only what is good, and to expose faults? Soon after this review, a pamphlet came before the world, purporting to be a vindication of Count Pulaski, from a censure made by the author of the '*Life of Greene*,' against the military character of that celebrated Polish chief. That pamphlet we also read, and was struck with the honest zeal, and force of argument, with which a veteran friend of Pulaski defended his military fame, and rebutted the offensive charge.

Another review grew out of this pamphlet, in which we took occasion to introduce a few particulars concerning the romantic life and character of Pulaski, and to add such strictures as occurred to us, on that part of the '*Life of Greene*,' which related

\* *North American Review*, Vol. XV. p. 416, for October, 1823.

to this subject.\* Judge Johnson could restrain himself no longer. As for the 'Vindication of Pulaski,' he had only 'cast his eye over the title page, and thrown it by, well satisfied that any production with such a title must be beneath his notice.' But when the review came out, he relented. He then felt 'compelled, however reluctant, to come once more before the public;' and, as he has written elaborate 'Remarks' on the pamphlet and review, there is just ground for presuming, that he conquered his antipathy so far as to read them both. We can hardly commend his wisdom in this course, feeling assured that his first argument of silent contempt would have been more successful. But it is not for us to teach an opponent the use of his best weapons. The title of the Remarks here mentioned, is that placed first at the head of this article. Then followed a 'Reply' to these Remarks, by Colonel Bentalou, the author of the 'Vindication of Pulaski,' written in a temperate and dignified tone, in which he reiterates what he had before stated, and confirms it by additional proofs. To these two pamphlets, particularly the former, our observations will be chiefly confined.

A paragraph in the exordium of Judge Johnson's performance, we beg leave to quote at large.

'That I should be assailed by the *North American Review*,' says he, 'excites no surprise with me. It is what I foretold to my friends explicitly and confidently long before it occurred. For I had reason to think, that there were individuals connected with that Review, whose eternal enmity I had incurred, from causes, which I *have no reason to blush at*. Still I entertained a hope, that there would have been found character enough in the conductors of that work, to repel any attempt to make it the instrument of private or party views. My experience satisfies me, that they only require some specious disguise, some mere pretext, for rather lending themselves *voluntarily* than otherwise to such attempts.' p. 5.

Now what can be the author's point in this paragraph, we are utterly at a loss to divine. There is no doubt deep meaning in it, particularly in the italics, which are his own, but it is quite too deep for us to fathom. We trust, that no Judge of the Supreme Court of the United States has 'reason to blush' for his conduct on any occasion, and much less on so unimportant a one, as that of having an imaginary difference with the 'individuals

\* See *North American Review*, Vol. XX. p. 375, for April, 1825.

connected with a Review.' Why should he blush? Ah, indeed, why should he, unless at being found in such company, among 'the vainest of the mortal race?' We are sorry, moreover, to hear him talk so much about 'enemies,' 'personal enmity,' 'eternal enmity.' From the language and tone of this pamphlet, one would be almost tempted to think, that he had not a friend upon earth. We do not believe his case is half so bad, as his apprehensions, or his warmth of feeling, would make it; and we can assure him, that when he foretold so 'explicitly and confidently' the assault of the *North American Review*, he had none but friends among those connected with that work. And further to remove his erroneous impressions, we assure him, that in the matter about Pulaski, which disturbed him so much, no two persons ever exchanged words with direct reference to that article, till it appeared from the press; and we should be willing to pledge ourselves, for the application of the spirit of this remark in every other case, in which the author has been noticed in our work. If this is making him of less consequence in the eyes of the *North American Reviewers*, than he had supposed, we cannot help it; we state the simple fact. And justice to some individual, or individuals, to whom he pointedly alludes in the above paragraph, although unknown to us, renders such an explicit declaration necessary.

The following paragraph is too remarkable to be passed over, whether considered in its meaning, the beauty of its figures, the delicacy of its sentiments, or the peculiar felicity of its phraseology and style.

'It cannot be denied,' observes Judge Johnson, 'that there is something of a military air in the late combined operations against myself; in the simultaneous attack from the right at Richmond, under the signature of Hamilton; from the centre at Baltimore, through this pamphlet [Mr Bentalou's 'Reply']; and from the left at Boston, under the banner of the Reviewer. One might be pardoned for suspecting that war on so extended a scale indicated talents, which had filled the highest military and civil stations, were it not for one obvious characteristic equally manifesting itself in every movement. They are the attack of the brigand or assassin; they belong not to open warfare. They are the movements of the aspirant for a scalp or a purse, and not the noble darings of that towering genius, that would have given the finale to our revolution, with which most revolutions have concluded, to wit, military despotism and consequent usurpation; justice ad-

ministered at the point of the bayonet, under the surveillance of avarice, and the guidance of the speculator on public distress and private misery.' pp. 8, 9.

We have quoted the whole paragraph, as a specimen of the author's mode of thinking and writing, when he gets upon a favorite topic. The first sentence is the only part that requires our notice. In all the rest he at least forgets, or disregards, one of the maxims of his own profession, that words should be used not merely as words, but to denote ideas and things; *in verbis non verba, sed res et ratio quærenda est*. But letting this pass, has there ever so extravagant a notion entered the brain of a mortal, since the hallucinations of the knight of La Mancha, as that in which the author has a vision of the 'combined operations' of half the continent in array against him? In one respect there is a difference in the two cases. Don Quixote looked forward to adventures, and trusted to the potency of his own arm for raising antagonists, worthy of his dignity and prowess; while our modern knight sees the phalanxes of his foes already marshalled in battle array, and gathering from distant regions to encounter his might, from the 'left, the centre, and the right,' with 'signatures, pamphlets, and the banner of a reviewer.' With as much truth as eloquence, did good old Robert Burton write, to prove the whole world insane; the only difference exists in the different modes of showing madness; it is our author's foible to think himself the great object of notice, nay, of the 'combined operations,' and 'simultaneous attack' of the centre and wings of the nation.

But there is another symptom of the author's singular obliquity of mind, not less extraordinary than this. He tries to persuade himself, that all the forces, in what he calls the centre and the left, have been drawn from a single point. In other words, he insinuates, that Colonel Bentalou's first pamphlet in defence of Pulaski, our review of that pamphlet, and an article in the United States Magazine, which seems to annoy him a good deal, were all written by the same hand! Listen to his remarks on this head.

'The perusal of a very few pages of these publications was sufficient to satisfy me, beyond a doubt, of the quarter, from which the attack proceeded. It is impossible for any reader to be so blind, as not to perceive the common origin of this pamphlet, and of the review of the Life of Greene, published in the United States Magazine, for January, 1823; not less impossible

than for any one to be so dull, as not to discover the intimate fellowship between the author of this pamphlet and its reviewer. There are passages dispersed through the work, with a view to give it a semblance of genuineness, but the veil is so flimsy as only to excite a smile at the folly, that could suppose itself cunning enough to conceal the fraud.' p. 6.

In another place, alluding to our review, he says, 'the name of a venerable old man, known to have been the companion and friend of Pulaski, is made use of to give an air of authenticity to the pamphlet, and a sanction to the gross imputations, which it casts upon the author of the *Life of Greene*.' Again, we are charged with 'crouching behind a mere man of straw,' and 'cloaking ourselves with the fair character of the honest old Pole,' (who, by the way, is no Pole at all, but a French officer, that early espoused the American cause,) and, lastly, with 'attempting to pass an honest man off as the writer of that pamphlet.' What will the Judge say, now that Colonel Bentalou has come out with his Reply, and declared himself the author? He has told us beforehand what he would say, and in the following words. 'Nor, if Mr Bentalou has really given the sanction of his name to it, would I be led to change my opinion on this point by anything, that could come from Mr Bentalou.' Even the 'venerable and honest man,' one of the earliest defenders of American liberty, an eyewitness of nearly all he relates, esteemed by all who have known him, enjoying the entire confidence of the government to the present day, and under whose fair name we are accused of cloaking our sins of authorship, even this man is no longer to be believed, when his positive statements are not in accordance with the conjectures of Judge Johnson. When he arrives at this point, his honesty is at an end. Whether our author's sagacity, in discovering that a single hand wrote all the pieces to which he alludes, or his consistency in speaking of Colonel Bentalou, be the more to be wondered at, we shall submit to the decision of others.

Judge Johnson has scrutinized at some length our account of Pulaski in Poland, but as he has added nothing, which had not already come under our observation while examining the subject, we shall not follow him through this part of his pamphlet. We stop only to notice one or two discrepancies, into which he has fallen, by attempting to depart from our representation. We have always supposed Pulaski in Poland to have fought for liberty, against usurpation and tyranny. Such is the voice of

history, as it has come to our ears. But Judge Johnson sustains the singular paradox, of first denying the fact and then proving it to be true. He begins by affirming, that Pulaski was one of a 'band of intolerant persecutors;' that 'to represent such men as combating for liberty, is a farce; nor less so to laud the *republican* virtues of an individual, whose life was devoted to the maintenance of a despotism, which chose to assume the title of the Polish Republic.' But hear what he says three pages onwards, in quoting from Castera, his favorite author. 'The confederates had elected for a general a noble Polonese, named Pulaski, an intrepid man, and *so violent for liberty*, that he did not hesitate to promote even by crimes, the *most honorable of causes*.' Here, then, we have the astonishing phenomenon of an 'intolerant persecutor,' without 'republican virtues,' 'devoted to the maintenance of despotism,' and yet 'violent for liberty,' and in 'promoting the most honorable of causes!' What does our author mean? Both of these descriptions cannot be true. To which horn of the dilemma does he attach himself? Which of these contradictory statements does he really believe? On the principles of the common law, we have a right to presume the latter; *judicia posteriora sunt in lege fortiora*; and thus he is on our side in spite of himself, and the dispute on this point is at an end.

We delight not to show off such faults in a grave writer of history, but we must do our duty and proceed. One fact mentioned by us, as evincing the improbability that Pulaski was guilty of the gross neglect of duty in the battle of Germantown, ascribed to him by Judge Johnson, was, that he received his appointment to the command of the cavalry by the recommendation of Washington, who never afterwards expressed any public disapprobation of his conduct. Of this fact our author expresses a decided and formal disbelief.

'I find nothing,' he remarks, 'in the official correspondence of Washington on the subject. Nor do I believe, that it was on his recommendation, that congress first created Pulaski a general of cavalry. Washington never could have recommended a measure so unjust and disgusting to his own cavalry officers.' p. 36.

Thus far Judge Johnson. Now let us turn to the second volume of Washington's Official Letters, p. 157. What do we find there? Washington writes to the president of Congress,

'Having endeavored, at the solicitation of the Count de Pulaski, to think of some mode for employing him in our service

there is none occurs to me, liable to so few inconveniences and exceptions, as the giving him the command of the horse. This department is still without a head, as I have not, in the present deficiency of brigadiers with the army, thought it advisable to take one from the foot for that command.' 'This gentleman, we are told, has been like us, engaged in defending the liberty and independence of his country, and has sacrificed his fortune to his zeal for those objects. He derives from hence a title to our respect, that ought to operate in his favor, as far as the good of the service will permit.'

Such was the recommendation of General Washington ; and the consequence of it may be seen, in the Journals of Congress, for September 15th, 1777, as follows. 'Resolved, that a *commander of the horse* be appointed, with the rank of a brigadier ; the ballots being taken, Count Pulaski was elected.' These extracts, compared with Judge Johnson's statements, require no comment.

We cannot help observing, nevertheless, how peculiarly ill timed are some of this writer's charges against others, when considered as standing in the same pamphlet, and almost on the same page, that contains the gross blunders here exposed. He makes it a light matter to talk of the 'deplorable ignorance,' 'absolute effrontery,' and 'false statements' of his opponents, and to refer them without ceremony to their 'hornbooks.' He kindles into a flame in a moment, upon the slightest insinuation, that he may have been in a mistake, or ventured a doubtful conjecture. To distrust his knowledge, or his judgment, is to forfeit all claims, not merely to his courtesy, but to his charity. Yet we here find him ignorant of the very elements of the history of the Revolution, which he has written two quarto volumes to illustrate, and in which he professes to have made many discoveries, and corrected many errors. A writer of revolutionary history not acquainted with Washington's official letters ! As well might we talk of a scholar not acquainted with his alphabet. Let the author of the *Life of Greene* make a few more such exposures, and it will require no *Œdipus* to solve the mystery of his great work having been so coldly received by the public.

But it is time for us to recur to the main point of the controversy, originating in Judge Johnson's account of the battle of Germantown. He ascribes the defeat on that occasion, mainly to the fault of Count Pulaski, in being guilty of a culpable neglect

of duty. As this was the first hint that any historian had given of such a charge, it was natural that Colonel Bentalou, who was an officer in Pulaski's legion, was at his side when he received his mortal wound at the siege of Savannah, and with him when he breathed his last, should be eager to defend the hitherto unsullied military reputation of his friend and commander, and should appeal to the public in his behalf. Hence has grown up the controversy, in which we have found ourselves unwarily involved. In its various historical relations, the subject has some importance, and on this ground our readers will pardon us for entering into it a little in detail.

Our author expresses great disapprobation of all previous accounts of the battle of Germantown, and, after a lapse of almost fifty years, imagines he has discovered the true key for unlocking every difficulty. It had eluded the search of former historians, and its hiding place was unknown even to the general officers, who were themselves leaders in the battle. Well may he exult in such a discovery at the present day, and cry out, like the enraptured philosopher of Syracuse, *eureka, eureka*. 'All the writers on the American war,' says he, 'seem to have vied with each other in working up this battle to a scene of the most abject confusion.' Observe, reader, '*abject* confusion.' How is light to be brought out of this darkness, and the events of the battle to be set in due order, and its fatal issue accounted for? Why, in the simplest way possible. The author's key will put all things right in the twinkling of an eye. You have only to take his word for it, that, during a forced march of the American army of sixteen miles, in the night, Count Pulaski, with a party of patrols, found leisure to go into a farmhouse, and betake himself quietly to sleep; and that, while he was in this unmilitary attitude, the enemy's patrols came upon him, who, civilly declining to disturb his slumbers, scampered away to the British army with the intelligence of the approach of the Americans. Hence the enemy was prepared for the onset, and hence the disasters of the day. Such is the magic of the author's key, and such the substance of what he very justly calls his 'new views' of the battle of Germantown.

Let it not be said, that we treat this grave matter of a battle and a defeat, with too much levity. Pulaski, that miracle of valor and military enterprise, in Europe and America, reposing in the arms of Morpheus, in the midst of the heat, and haste, and excitement of a forced march to battle! The fate of the

day depending on this incident! *Risum teneatis?* Saving the anecdote of Major Burnet's cue, and General Greene's curls, related by the author in his description of the battle, we do verily believe there is nothing recorded in sober history more nearly approaching the marvellous, than this vision of Pulaski's marching slumbers, and their consequences. But let us attend to Judge Johnson's own language on the subject.

'The Americans are not a little at a loss to account for some events, merely because they write under the erroneous impression, that the surprise was complete. Yet the British assert, and on this point their assertion is not to be controverted, that their patrols had given them an hour's notice of the approaching attack. It is not to be wondered at, that the Americans doubt this upon the supposition, that the British patrol could not have approached the American army, without being discovered by their own. But it is a melancholy fact, of which few were informed, that the celebrated Pulaski, who commanded the patrol, was found by General Washington himself asleep in a farmhouse. Policy only, and regard to the rank and misfortunes of the offender, could have induced the general to suppress the fact. Yet to this circumstance, most probably, we are to attribute the success of the enemy's patrol, in approaching near enough to discover the advance of the American column.' *Life of Greene*, vol. i. p. 83.

Again, in his 'Remarks,' speaking of the loss of the battle, on the part of the Americans, the author says, 'the leading cause, according to my views of the affair, and that in which all others had their origin, was the notice communicated to the British, by their patrols, of the advance of the American army.' Laying down this axiom as a basis, he builds upon it his new theory of the battle of Germantown, tracing all the misfortunes of that luckless day to the untimely slumbers of Pulaski. Now to us this seems not only a gratuitous labor, but without foundation in fact or probability. Who has ever complained, that there was any such mighty difficulty in understanding the details of that battle? Or who has called for any new theory to make the matter more plain, or the causes more evident, than they appear in Washington's own official letter, written the day after the encounter? The statement there made, harmonizes perfectly with the descriptions of other general officers, and individuals, who were in the engagement; and why come forward at this day with 'new views,' apochryphal testimonies, and conjectural emendations? The dispirited condition of the troops, who

had been for several weeks under incessant and hard service ; their fatigue after a long march in the night ; the extreme fog-giness of the morning, which prevented the plan of attack from being carried into methodical execution ; the delay of a division of the army at Chew's house ; and the failure of ammunition in the heat of the battle ; these have been represented by other historians, as the remote and proximate causes of the retreat of the American forces, at the moment when victory was declaring itself in their favor ; and these causes are so obvious, and so adequate to the effects, and have been so unanimously received as such, that we are justified in repeating it to be a gratuitous and unnecessary service, for any one to attempt to set them aside, or weaken their influence by new discoveries and an imaginary theory.

Before proceeding further to remark on the paragraph quoted above, we shall gratify our readers by inserting here a letter from Colonel Timothy Pickering, a name too well known in this country, during the last half century, to need any encomiums from us. He was present at the battle of Germantown, by the side of Washington, and, from his station, had as good an opportunity of knowing the events of the day, as any other person. This letter is of great value as a historical document, and peculiarly interesting as a narrative of what took place, near the commander in chief, at the critical time of the action.

*Salem, August 23d, 1826.*

SIR,

‘ Nearly forty-nine years have elapsed since the battle of Germantown ; of course you may well suppose, that many facts respecting it are beyond my power of recollection ; while a few are indelibly impressed on my memory. Without repeating all your questions, I answer them by the following statement.

‘ 1. I did not know at the time, nor do I recollect ever to have heard, that Pulaski was found asleep, until it was mentioned by Judge Johnson, in his “ Life of General Greene.” Nor do I remember to have heard him censured for any neglect of duty, in the case referred to, the battle of Germantown. It was on the 15th of September, 1777, as appears by the Journals of Congress, that Count Pulaski was appointed commander of the horse, with the rank of brigadier general. He must have brought with him from Poland the reputation of a *good officer*, of which *vigilance*, when on duty, is an essential characteristic ; or, a perfect

stranger as he was, he would not have received that honorable appointment. The distance the army had to march, from its encampment on the Skippack road to Germantown, is estimated to be about sixteen miles ; and, therefore, (although I do not recollect it) a very temporary halt might have taken place ; but certainly not long enough for an officer, or private, to have retired to indulge in sleep in a farmhouse.

‘ 2. General Washington, in his letter to Congress of October the 5th, the day after the battle, says, “ that the army marched about seven o’clock in the evening of the third ; and that General Sullivan’s advanced party attacked the enemy’s picket at Mount Airy, or Mr Allen’s house, about sunrise the next morning, which presently gave way ; and his main body, consisting of the right wing, following soon, engaged the light infantry and other troops encamped near the picket, which they forced from their ground. Leaving their baggage, they retreated a considerable distance, having previously thrown a party into Mr Chew’s house.” \* The term here applied to these advanced corps of the enemy, that they were “ *forced* from their ground,” shows that they were *in arms*, and *resisted* the assailants ; and the previous brush with the picket, a guard always posted in advance on purpose to give notice of an enemy’s approach, roused “ the light infantry and other troops,” who had time enough to take their arms and form for action. They retreated, of necessity, before the greatly superior force of the whole right wing of our army. But the “ leaving of their baggage ” authorizes the inference, that they had no knowledge of the march of the American army, until the firing in the engagement with the picket guard gave the alarm. If then these advanced corps of the enemy were not, in the strict sense of the word *surprised*, that is, “ caught napping,” unprepared for action, much less could the main body, posted in the centre of Germantown, two miles farther off, have been *surprised*. This distance gave them ample time to prepare for action, in any manner which the attack of their enemy should require.

‘ 3. You ask, “ at what distance from Chew’s house the attack commenced ? ” At that time I was a stranger in that part of the country. From my subsequent acquaintance with it, during my residence in Pennsylvania, I should estimate the distance of Mount Airy from Philadelphia to be eight miles, Chew’s

\* Washington’s Official Letters, Vol. II. p. 177.

house seven miles, and the centre of Germantown six miles. And these I think are the distances, as I have occasionally heard them mentioned.

‘ 4. You ask, “ how long a pause was made at Chew’s house ; and what space of time probably intervened between the beginning of the action, and the general engagement at the head of the village ? ” The pause at Chew’s house, in the manner I shall presently mention, probably delayed the advance of the *rear division* of our army into action for half an hour. And taking the attack of the picket at Mount Airy, as the beginning of the action, it was probably near half an hour before it became general *as to the whole of Sullivan’s column* ; and *this* general engagement must have commenced *after he had passed Chew’s house* ; for I saw not one dead man until I had passed it, and then but one, lying in the road near where I fell in with General Sullivan. I presume that, following close on the heels of the British battalion of light infantry and the fortieth regiment, which were retiring before him, Sullivan, with his column, had passed Chew’s house, without annoyance from it. For it must have taken some time for Colonel Musgrave, who entered it with six companies of the fortieth regiment, to barricade and secure the doors, and the windows of the lower story, before he would be ready to fire from the chamber windows ; and it was from them that the firing I saw proceeded.

‘ In the march of the army, General Washington, following Sullivan’s column, kept in the road leading to and through Germantown to Philadelphia. When we had entered the northern part of the village, we heard, in advance of us (I was riding by the General’s side), a very heavy fire of musketry. General Sullivan’s divisions, it was evident, were warmly engaged with the enemy ; but neither was in sight. This fire, brisk and heavy, continuing, General Washington said to me ; “ I am afraid General Sullivan is throwing away his ammunition ; ride forward and tell him to preserve it. ” I do not know what was the precise idea, which at that moment struck the mind of the General. I can only conjecture, that he was apprehensive that Sullivan, after meeting the enemy in his front, kept up his brisk and incessant fire, when the haziness of the air, and its increased obscurity, from the burning of so much powder, prevented his troops having such a distinct view of the enemy, as would render their fire efficient. Be this as it may, the instant I received the General’s orders, I rode forward ; and in the road, three or four hundred

yards *beyond* Chew's house, met Sullivan, and delivered to him the General's orders.

‘At this time I had never heard of Chew's house ; and had no idea that an enemy was in my rear. The first notice I received of it was from the whizzing of musket balls, across the road, before, behind, and above me, as I was returning, after delivering the orders to Sullivan. Instantly turning my eye to the right, I saw the blaze of the muskets, whose shot were still aimed at me, from the windows of a large stone house, standing back about a hundred yards from the road. This was Chew's house. Passing on, I came to some of our artillery, who were firing very *obliquely* on the front of the house. I remarked to them, that in that position their fire would be unavailing, and that the only chance of their shot making any impression on the house, would be by moving down and firing *directly* on its front.\* Then immediately passing on, I rejoined General Washington, who, with General Knox and other officers, was in front of a stone house (nearly all the houses in Germantown were of stone), next northward of the open field in which Chew's house stood. I found they were discussing, in Washington's presence, this question ; Whether the whole of our troops then behind should immediately advance, regardless of the enemy in Chew's house, or first summon them to surrender ? General Knox strenuously urged the sending of a summons. Among other things, he said, “it would be unmilitary to leave a castle in our rear.” I answered, “Doubtless that is a correct general maxim ; but it does not apply in this case. We know the extent of this castle (Chew's house) ; and to guard against the danger from the enemy's sallying, and falling on the rear of our troops, a small regiment may be posted here to watch them ; and if they sally, such a regiment *will take care of them*. But,” I added, “to summon them to surrender will be useless. We are now in the midst of the battle ; and its issue is unknown. In this state of uncertainty, and so well secured as the enemy find themselves, they will not regard a summons ; *they will fire at your flag*.”† However, a flag was sent with a summons.

\* ‘The heaviest artillery then with the army, were, I think, only brass six pounders.’

† ‘This is the statement I had occasion to make eighteen years ago, in a letter to Governor Sullivan. I marked it with inverted commas, because I perfectly remembered the ideas I expressed, as the words used import ; and I am also sure, that there is no material change in

Lieutenant Smith of Virginia, my assistant in the office of adjutant general, volunteered his service to carry it. As he was advancing, a shot from the house gave him a wound of which he died.\*

‘Whatever delay, in the advance of the division in our rear, was occasioned by the pause at Chew’s house, I am satisfied that Sullivan’s column did not halt there at all, as mentioned by Judge Johnson. The column was certainly not in sight, when the General sent me with the orders already noticed; and it is alike certain, that it was then beyond Chew’s house. Nor were the enemy forming under cover of the house, or I must have seen them. *When* the orders were sent to our troops in the rear to advance, I do not know; but it must have been subsequent to the sending of the flag; and, I should think, twenty minutes, at least, after it was found that an enemy was in the house. The General did not pass it at all. I had remained near him until our troops were retreating; when I rode off to the right, to endeavor to stop and rally those I met retiring, in companies and squads; but it was impracticable; their ammunition, I suppose, had generally been expended.

‘5. In the aforementioned letter from General Washington to Congress, he says, “the attack from our left column, under General Greene, began about three quarters of an hour after that from the right.” You ask the cause of this. The answer is obvious. The right column, under General Sullivan, which Washington accompanied, marched on the direct road to Germantown. Greene, with his column, was obliged to make a circuit to the left, to gain the road which led to his point of attack. The columns being thus entirely separated, and at a distance from each other, no calculations of their commanders could have

the language, as uttered by me at the instant. In writing it, I endeavored to recollect the very words I had used.’

\* ‘General Henry Lee, in his “Memoirs of the War in the Southern States,” mentions the zeal with which Lieutenant Colonel Hamilton (Alexander Hamilton, then one of Washington’s *aids de camp*, and since so well known for the display of his eminent talents, in the service of his country) urged the propriety of passing Chew’s house. This must have been while I was absent, carrying the General’s orders to Sullivan. I perfectly remember, that when poor Smith was brought off wounded, Major Gibbs, who was in the General’s family, said to me, “While you were absent, I offered to carry the flag; I bless my stars that it was not accepted.”’

insured their arriving at the same time at their respective points of attack.

‘Judge Johnson, in his “Life of Greene,” has represented as “almost ludicrous” the “scene” exhibited by some writers, of the discussion near Chew’s house, in the presence of General Washington, in which it is hinted that opinions were “obtruded ;” and that even field officers may have expressed *their* opinions ; “but,” he adds, “General Washington was listening to the counsels of his own mind and of his general officers.” I know, however, that he did listen to the discussion ; and Lee, commanding a troop of horse, on that day on duty near the General’s person, accounts for his determination to send the summons. “Knox,” he says, “being always high in the General’s confidence, his opinion prevailed.” Further I must remark, that the general officers, whom the Judge supposes to have been present, and advising the commander in chief, were then in their proper places, with their divisions and brigades. Knox alone, of the general officers, was present. Commanding in the artillery department, and the field pieces being distributed among the brigades of the army, he was always at liberty, in time of action, to attend the commander in chief. Some two or three years since, I wrote to Judge Johnson, informing him of his mistakes in the matter noticed in this paragraph. Others of his details of this battle, which are inconsistent with the statements I have here given to you, must be incorrect. The truth is, that General Washington, not sanguine in his own opinions, and his diffidence being probably increased by a feeling sense of his high responsibility, as Commander in Chief, was ever disposed, when occasions occurred, to consult those officers who were near him, in whose discernment and fidelity he placed a confidence ; and certainly his decisions were often influenced by their opinions. This is within my own knowledge.

I am, &c.

T. PICKERING.’

In this letter we are presented with a lucid exposition of the difficulties of the battle, which Judge Johnson has conceived to be so inexplicable, in all former narratives, and which he has rendered still more perplexing, by his attempt to explain them. His ‘new views’ happen to be all wrong, and wholly unnecessary to make out a consistent account of the principal incidents of the engagement. Two or three of his new positions shall now be examined.

1. Respecting the slumbers of Pulaski, which the Judge considers the prime cause of all the disasters of the day. In a case like this, it is difficult to prove a negative. No man living, it may be, can say that Pulaski did not sleep, while on the march from Skippack creek to Mount Airy, because there may be no man living, who was constantly in his presence. All probability is certainly against it, even leaving the character of Pulaski out of the question. The conviction must be strong on the mind of every one, as it is on that of Colonel Pickering, that no officer, or private, could have found an opportunity to sleep. If there was any halt at all, it must have been very short, for Colonel Pickering does not recollect any; and considering the distance marched and the time employed, it would hardly seem possible, that the army could have stopped on the way. To make his theory hang together, Judge Johnson assures us, that 'Pulaski must have retired early,' thereby affording time for the British patrols to give due notice of the movement of the American forces. This is involving the matter in a still greater absurdity, for it is supposing the army to have halted near the beginning of its march, and rested there, while Pulaski was calmly reposing in a farmhouse; whereas, if there was a halt at any time, it must have been after the men had become somewhat fatigued, and not long before the commencement of the action.

Moreover, how does it happen, that no more than one officer near General Washington's person, should have known the fact, and heard the General's reprimand? Where were Knox, and Pickering, and Hamilton, and Lee, whose duty on that day brought them in contact with the Commander in Chief? Is it possible, that so gross a neglect on the part of an officer, a neglect in which originated the entire failure of the enterprise, should have been kept a secret from them? Is it possible, that such a piece of intelligence should not have rung through the whole army in twelve hours' time, and have flown on the wings of the wind to every corner of the continent? Is it possible, that the officer, who, by sleeping on his post, was the means of losing the battle of Germantown, should have been continued in his place, and entrusted till the day of his death with an important command? Is it possible, that such a secret should have remained hidden from the whole world, till fortyfive years after the event, eluding the prying eye of the historians and military critics of this battle? Is it possible, that Washington could have overlooked such a neglect of duty, and neither have mentioned

it in his public report, nor whispered it to any person, although his own reputation, and that of the army, were so intimately connected with it? Are these things possible? We say they are not. The conviction on our mind is irresistible, without any other testimony than the simple statement of the case. Nor do we believe, that any man, who fairly examines the subject in this light, will come to a different conclusion. And when, in addition to this, we consider, that the great military fame of Pulaski was chiefly founded on the qualities here denied to him, vigilance and promptitude, that in the perilous scenes in Poland, where for many years he acted a bold and leading part, he never was surprised by his enemies, nor taken prisoner; when we remember, that all Europe had resounded with the report of his valor, his achievements, and his extraordinary military talents; we shall then have other arguments in his favor, that will weigh heavily with most minds.

As a balance against the weight of these circumstances, Judge Johnson cites the single authority of General Pinckney, who was aid to the Commander in Chief. We have full confidence in the veracity, and respect for the high character, of that tried patriot and statesman. But on the present occasion we hesitate not to say, that we believe he was mistaken. The testimony of one man, in so remarkable a case, where there were many others as likely to know the fact as himself, and whose duty it was to report it, makes no impression on our judgment, when brought in competition with the multitude of impossibilities, which have just been enumerated. Nor have we ever seen General Pinckney's name to any statement of the kind, nor any explanation by him of the thousand difficulties, which embarrass his evidence. How he would have reconciled them we presume not to conjecture; but as the case now stands, we doubt whether any person can examine the whole ground without being convinced, that General Pinckney's impression was erroneous.

Again, how does Judge Johnson dispose of the difficulty attending the silence of Washington, in a case of such moment, where his duty as Commander in Chief, justice to himself, to his officers, to the nation, imperiously demanded from him public exposure and censure? In a most extraordinary way truly. He says, that 'policy only, and regard to the rank and misfortunes of the offender, could have induced the general to suppress the fact.' We ask if so dark a stain can attach to the character of Washington, as that of screening from punishment and dis-

grace an 'offender,' who had been guilty of such gross neglect as is ascribed to Pulaski? We trust not. In his 'Remarks,' the author enlarges upon this topic, and tells us, that 'Washington was often obliged to temporize,' that it 'could seldom comport with his dignity to be the accuser of an officer,' and that 'to him there would have been no pleasure in the task.' Indeed, *no pleasure in the task!* And is this the reason given by a judge, why the guilty should go unpunished? General Washington sacrificing justice to 'policy,' 'temporizing,' neglecting to notice an offender, because it did not 'comport with his dignity,' and because he had 'no pleasure in the task!' *Ohe, jam satis!*

In a postscript to his pamphlet, the author appeals to a declaration of Lafayette, in the following rather equivocal language. 'If General Pinckney's testimony to support the fact related of Count Pulaski could need corroboration, it can be further proved, that General Lafayette, when lately in Columbia, declared it to be true of his own knowledge.' Now it happens, that when Lafayette was in Baltimore, he was directly asked by Colonel Bentalou, if he ever heard the report of Pulaski's being asleep; to which he instantly replied, 'No, never.' Mr Barney, the present representative in Congress from Baltimore, writes thus to Colonel Bentalou. 'I distinctly recollect, that when you asked General Lafayette if he ever had heard General Washington mention, that Count Pulaski had been found asleep at his post, previously to the battle of Germantown, or that the surprise was prevented by neglect of duty on his part, General Lafayette replied with warmth, "No, never;" and proceeded to speak of Pulaski in the highest terms of praise.' So much for the hearsay report of what Lafayette declared at Columbia. And, again, as to the fact having been '*true of his own knowledge*,' it unluckily turns out, that he was not present at the battle, but was then at Bethlehem, in consequence of the wound he had received in the battle of Brandywine.

But even taking the position to be settled, that Pulaski did sleep on his march, no two things can be more remote from each other, than this cause and the effects ascribed to it by Judge Johnson. Were the British patrols any more likely to see a sleeping, than a waking man? Besides, are we to understand, that all Pulaski's party were asleep as well as himself? In short, look at the thing in what light you will, and the circumstance of Pulaski's having been asleep or not, can have no con-

nexion whatever with the issue of the battle. We deny, moreover, that either he, or any of his men, or any of the American advanced parties, were seen by the British patrols, in time to communicate this intelligence, before the battle commenced. This will appear in what we have to say on the next topic.

2. Judge Johnson accounts for some of the blunders, which he supposes historians to have committed in describing this battle, by considering them to have written 'under the erroneous impression that the surprise was complete.' Now, from the best authority to which any person at the present day can have access, from the unanimous records of history, and from the whole train of events during the battle, we undertake to affirm, that the *surprise was complete*; in other words, that the British army, stationed across the village of Germantown, had no knowledge of the intended attack of the Americans, till the firing was heard when the engagement began at Mount Airy, two miles from the encampment of the main army. Gordon says, that 'the royal army was indeed completely surprised.'\* Andrews, a British writer, speaks of the 'suddenness of the attack,' and of the '*first surprise*.'† In a work on the Revolution, ascribed to Captain Hall of the British army, who writes as if he were present in the battle, we have the following remarkable statement.

'Notwithstanding this enterprise was conducted with great secrecy by the enemy, yet we had strong reason to believe, that they were meditating some important design. A prisoner or two, made very early in the morning, who had strayed from their advanced guard, and gave information of the rebel army being in full march towards us, afforded hints that might have been turned to great advantage, and if properly adverted to, possibly ended in the total destruction of the enemy. *And when the firing began from the pickets, and advanced battalion of light infantry, whose camp the enemy not only penetrated but plundered, it even then gained but little credit at head quarters, where this commotion was supposed to arise, rather from a flying party of the enemy, than a serious attack.*'‡

Here the author takes the surprise for granted, and censures the commander of the royal army for his apathy, in not having anticipated it. Stedman, another British writer, in alluding to

\* History of the American Revolution, Vol. II. p. 526.

† Andrews' History of the Late War, Vol. II. pp. 373. 375.

‡ History of the Civil War in America, Vol. I. p. 321. London, 1780.

the affair at Chew's house, says, that, by the delay there, 'time was afforded to the *rest of the British line to get under arms.*'\* But why was it not already under arms, if knowledge of the advance of the Americans had been obtained nearly two hours before, as it must have been, according to Judge Johnson's interpretation? A stronger proof, indeed, of the complete surprise of the enemy, could hardly be furnished, than General Washington's own letter, as quoted above by Colonel Pickering. The firing commenced with the enemy's picket, which instantly retreated. This was evidently the first notice of the intended attack, received by the next division of the enemy, posted near the picket; for although they had time to rally to arms, yet so sudden was their retreat, that their baggage was left behind, as stated by General Washington. This circumstance is inexplicable, upon the supposition that the British had a previous knowledge of the contemplated attack; for it was a matter of course, in any event, that these outposts would be driven in, and the baggage would as certainly have been secured in the rear. Not only their baggage was thus neglected, but their tents were left standing. Colonel Bentalou testifies that he saw them as he passed through the camp. We have before us a manuscript copy of a letter, written by General Smallwood to the governor of Maryland, five days after the engagement, in which he says, 'The retreat was prosecuted with little or no other loss, than the field of action, which, to our reproach, was abandoned in the midst of victory, after taking possession of the *enemy's encampment and baggage*, with many pieces of artillery and military stores.' If all these circumstances do not prove a surprise on the part of the enemy, we should despair of proving it by any force of argument, or combination of facts. The time between the beginning of the attack at Mount Airy, and the meeting of the two armies in Germantown, was abundantly sufficient for the British forces to get ready for action, and to proceed as far as they had done towards the head of the village.

The mistake fallen into by Judge Johnson, in regard to the time at which the action began, is not a little extraordinary. He says it was 'about *four o'clock* in the morning.' But Washington writes, in his official report, that the attack on the picket, at Mount Airy, was '*about sunrise*,' being two full hours later than the time specified by our author. At first we were puzzled to

\* History of the American War, Vol. I p. 299.

account for this discrepancy, presuming no American historian would describe the battle of Germantown, without reading Washington's official letter on the subject; and even now we can explain it, only by recurring to the author's new theory. He had laid it down as an axiom, that the British 'had an *hour's* notice,' by their patrols, of the approach of the American army. In Sir William Howe's official report, it is stated that this discovery was made 'at three o'clock in the morning.' To preserve the correctness of the axiom, therefore, it was necessary to fix the beginning of the battle at four o'clock, or one hour later, notwithstanding the plain declaration of Washington to the contrary. Sir William Howe says the action began 'soon after the break of day;' Stedman and Hall both use the same phrase, 'at the dawn of day.' But this is a point upon which Washington could not be mistaken. We have already said enough to show the error of the British commander's statement respecting the patrols. It was not likely he would report a surprise of his army to his own government. On what authority Judge Johnson writes, that 'the *British assert* that their patrols had given them an *hour's* notice of the approaching attack,' we know not. We have found no such assertion in any British author, nor seen any allusion to the patrols, except in Sir William Howe's report, and in the 'Annual Register,' which evidently copies that report.

3. We come at last to the affair of Chew's house. Colonel Pickering's letter gives a much more full, clear, and satisfactory account of this part of the battle, than has ever before appeared; and, at the same time it establishes the opinion derived from all former historians, it contradicts, in almost every essential particular, Judge Johnson's 'new views.' On this branch of the subject, little needs to be added to the letter of Colonel Pickering, except to point out a few more of our author's mistakes. In Lee's *Memoirs of the War* [vol. i. p. 29.], we are told, that 'the halt at Chew's house was taken *after some deliberation*, as the writer well recollects, being that day in the suite of the Commander in Chief, with a troop of dragoons charged with duty near his person. Many junior officers, at the head of whom were Colonel Pickering and Lieutenant Colonel Hamilton, urged with zeal the propriety of passing the house. Brigadier Knox opposed the measure with earnestness, denouncing the idea of leaving an armed force in the rear.' Judge Johnson says, in his 'Remarks,' that this halt 'was not ordered by Washington,'

that it 'was but momentary,' 'brief and involuntary,' and 'of very brief duration.' Our readers have seen, in Colonel Pickering's letter, that the halt *was* ordered by Washington; and, so far from being momentary, it continued for nearly half an hour, long enough for the British to form and manœuvre as they chose. These facts destroy the entire foundation of the new theory, for it is perfectly obvious, that this delay was the first and principal cause, if not the only one, of the retreat of Sullivan's division, and thereby the rout of the whole army, by so contagious an example. Had the rear divisions of the army, which were stopped during the conference mentioned above, been brought up immediately to the support of Sullivan, there is every probability, that the action would have terminated very differently, although other causes might have led to a defeat. As things actually turned out, however, it is certain, that the parley at Chew's house was the first and chief cause of the discomfiture.

Judge Johnson writes with a singular misapprehension of the train of events, as they occurred at this stage of the action. He says, 'It is true, that on reaching Chew's house, Sullivan's column was halted.' Yet it appears from Colonel Pickering's letter, that this is not true at all. Sullivan was several hundred yards in advance of the house, and actually engaged with the enemy, before it was known that any such obstacle existed. And what is still more remarkable, we do not find, that the author has anywhere mentioned the circumstance of the flag of truce, or the death of the brave and unfortunate Lieutenant Smith. Historical justice will hardly excuse such an omission. These incidents militate, to be sure, against the new theory, because they could not have occurred without something more than a 'brief and involuntary' pause; yet, we suppose, this would hardly be urged as an apocryph for passing them over.

But we must hasten to a close, having already, as we fear, trespassed unreasonably on the patience of our readers, although several topics have been left untouched. What the author will think of our presumption in questioning his infallibility, or in taking it upon us to point out a few of his mistakes, we cannot say; for he sets himself up very high, quite above the sphere of the common order of writers, shrouding the beams of his countenance in most 'disastrous eclipse,' frowning terror upon daring critics, and insisting that he is not to be looked at through the same puny optics, and judged by the same rules, as the multi-

tudes, who are clambering up the sides of the mountain of fame, on whose summit he has seated himself with much apparent composure. Unfortunately, we have but one set of optics, through which to view the moving panorama of authors, and if he suffers a diminution by the giddy height to which he has lifted himself up, the fault is not ours. We have seen it hinted, it is true, in a certain quarter, that 'the dignity of the Supreme Federal Court' is likely to be jeopardized, by bringing down a judge from his lofty preeminence, and placing him on the stand of critical investigation, in company with the hackney tribe of scribblers, such as reviewers, poets, essayists, novelists, jinglers of rhyme, oration makers, and the like. The thing does not appear to us in the same light. If a learned judge condescends to write a book, and a great book too, we hold it to be his duty, so far to imitate the virtues of Job, as to bear patiently the inflictions of merciless reviewers. What else are books written for, in these days, but to be reviewed? Not surely to be read. If our author really thinks so, we beg he will forthwith consult his publisher, and see how the supply, in the case of his own work, has corresponded with the demand.

The subject is, moreover, to be viewed under another aspect. We should be the last to speak lightly of dignities, though we do not believe in the divine right of kings, of bishops, or of judges. But the dignity we reverence is that of conduct and character. We consider true dignity to consist in a correct deportment, respect for others, and an upright discharge of duty, in whatever station a person may be placed by Providence. This is the whole amount of dignity. Hence it by no means follows, that he is the most dignified man, who sits in the highest place, any more than he who writes the largest book, or makes the longest speech to the empty seats in Congress hall. In short, there is no connexion between true dignity and station. Particular systems of action are adapted to particular stations, and all that dignity demands is, that these systems be properly applied. He, who misapplies these, is undignified. So a judge may be very dignified, when clothed in his robes, with wisdom on his brow, and thought in his features; but let him dress himself in a cap and bells or act the harlequin in the halls of justice, and the dignity of the judge will be no longer seen. The crier of the court may sustain all suitable dignity, while sitting in the crier's box, but place him on the bench, and he will be instantly transformed into another kind of personage. From these hints

we infer, that dignity is not confined to particular professions, nor classes of persons, not even to judges of the Supreme Court, although we are willing to confess, that when this body is convened, we know not a more imposing spectacle. Yet we maintain, that all dignity is not centered there, but much of it is to be found in other parts of the community; and even we, humble reviewers as we are, have the vanity to believe, that we have our share of dignity to uphold. In this respect, presumptuous as it may seem, we assert the right, nay, exercise it too, of putting ourselves on a level with the writer of the 'Life of Greene,' not by going up to the top of the hill where he sits, but by supposing him to have come down, for a short space, into the little valley where we dwell. Or, to speak more *à la militaire*, we meet him on the common ground of authors, a ground on which he has chosen to enter the lists, and where he has no right to look for any other than equals. The dignity of the craft, and not of the 'Supreme Federal Court,' is here to be regarded; and if the author of the 'Life of Greene' thinks that we, as a portion of the brotherhood, have not had this dignity sufficiently before our eyes, in what we have said of his work, we have only to entreat, upon the principles of equal justice, that he will cast back half an eye over the wanderings of his own pen, and then judge whether our dignity as reviewers, or his as a biographer, has met with the severer contusions. There is a maxim in the books, *lex æquitate gaudet*. It may here be reduced to practice.

We thought to subjoin a few observations on the general merits of the 'Life of Greene' as a work of history, but perhaps an opinion sufficiently accurate can be formed, on this point, from what has already been said. One remarkable fault, however, and one which, in our view, renders the book of almost no value, as a work of reference, we shall here mention a second time; we mean the total absence of authorities. The new description of the battle of Germantown, which we have seen to be so full of errors, is given without reference to a single authority in the work itself. There can be no greater defect than this in a history, in which many new facts are professedly brought out, and new opinions advanced. The chief value of a written history is in its truth, and next, in the evidences of its truth. We had before stated this objection strongly, and the author's reply is not less remarkable for its brevity, than its courteousness. He affirms, that the objection 'is not worthy of

the most common understanding,' and that he had done enough to state generally in his Introduction the origin of his materials. In this we differ from him *toto cælo*. But the strongest thing of all is yet to come. Says this accommodating historian, who carries himself so *suaviter in modo* and *fortiter in re*, 'any one, who had approached me in the attitude of a gentleman, might have satisfied his curiosity, or more laudable feelings, by a *private inquiry*.' What an immense facility is here offered to the student! All historical authority is hereafter to be settled, and all doubts cleared up, by a private correspondence with the author, whether he live ten or ten thousand miles off, in the present or a past age. No more notes of reference are wanted, no more consulting of books; the author himself is to be the centre of a correspondence with all the world, a living commentator, never to die, never to be weary of his great and varied vocation. No future Brodies or Lingards shall sharpen their pens, to assail the historical veracity of our author; a *private inquiry*, provided it be made 'in the attitude of a gentleman,' shall open the portals of knowledge, remove suspicion, and silence skepticism.

---

ART. XI.—*A Sketch of the Internal Condition of the United States of America, and of their Political Relations with Europe.* By A RUSSIAN. Translated from the French, By AN AMERICAN. *With notes.* Baltimore. 1826. 8vo. pp. 163.

A FOREIGNER's account of our institutions and manners always finds eager readers in America. We entertain this curiosity in common no doubt with all other people; but in us it has been heightened by some accidents in our situation, into a sort of impatient anxiety. Our portrait has been drawn by those, for the most part, whom some very intelligible feelings have prevented from regarding us with much good nature, while, at the same time, certain affinities existing between us, have encouraged a hope of better treatment at their hands. What has magnified the provocation is the respect we entertain for them at heart, and the means they possess, through the diffusion of their language